

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
EASTERN DIVISION

LESLEY SYNATRA TUCKER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No.: 1:17-cv-00497-MHH-SGC
)	
SHERIFF MATTHEW WADE, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	


MEMORANDUM OPINION

The magistrate judge filed a report on April 16, 2019, in which she recommended that the Court enter judgment in favor of the defendants based on Mr. Tucker's failure to exhaust administrative remedies. (Doc. 29). The magistrate judge advised the parties of their right to file specific written objections within 14 days. That time has expired, and the Court has not received objections from the parties.

A district court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). A district court reviews legal conclusions in a report *de novo* and reviews for plain error factual findings to which no objection is made. *Garvey v. Vaughn*, 993 F.2d 776, 779 n.9 (11th Cir. 1993); *see also LoConte v. Dugger*, 847 F.2d 745, 749 (11th Cir. 1988); *Macort v. Prem, Inc.*, 208 Fed. Appx. 781, 784 (11th Cir. 2006).

Having reviewed and considered the relevant materials in the court file, the Court adopts the magistrate judge's report and accepts her recommendation. As the magistrate judge indicated in her report, she treated the defendants' special report as a motion for summary judgment. (Doc. 29, p. 2). Accordingly, the Court will grant the pending motion for summary judgment and will enter judgment for the defendants on Mr. Tucker's remaining claim. (*See* Doc. 20).

DONE this 31st of May, 2019.



MADELINE HUGHES HAIKALA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE